

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-3, 5, 7-12, 14-20, and 27 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 11, and 19 are independent. In the Office Action dated September 19, 2006, Claims 1-3, 5, 7-12, 14-20, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-12, 14, 16-20, and 27-29 remain in this application with Claims 2 and 15 being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and Claims 28-29 being added by this Amendment. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action dated September 19, 2006, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-3, 5, 7-12, 14-20, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Star Office 5.1 Memorandum ("*Star Office*") in view of U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2004/0049294 A1 ("*Keen*"). Claims 1, 11, and 19 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "saving the first document with the generic information replacing the removed personal information, wherein saving the first document further comprises, in response to activating the privacy option, replacing the removed personal information with the generic information in both a memory representation of the first document and a file representation of the first document."

Amended Claim 19 includes a similar recitation to Claim 1. Amended Claim 11 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "receiving input by the document-generating program to save the document, wherein saving the document removes the one or more pieces of personal information from the document and the comment visible within block of the document or replacing replaces the one or more pieces of personal information with generic information in the document and the comment box visible within block of the document in both a memory representation of the document and a file representation of the document." Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 12, lines 11-29.

In contrast, *Star Office* at least does not teach or suggest either of the aforementioned recitations. For example, *Star Office* merely discloses screenshots associated with a properties dialog box for viewing and editing StarWriter document properties. Consequently, *Star Office* is completely silent regarding replacing personal information with generic information in both a memory representation of a document and a file representation of the document.

Furthermore, *Keen* does not overcome *Star Office*'s deficiencies. *Keen* merely discloses that, after given an access identification, a user can access a database system and request access to an object. (See paragraph [0007], lines 1-3.) The system then retrieves information pertaining to the individual user's privilege criteria and determines which information contained in the database may be accessed by the user. (See paragraph [0007], lines 3-6.) The system then filters the information including objects, their attributes, and associated documents according to the privilege information and gives the user limited access to the information. (See paragraph [0007], lines 6-9.) The requested and approved information can then be sent to the user. (See paragraph [0007], lines 9-11.) Like *Star Office*, *Keen* at least does not teach or suggest replacing personal information with generic information in both a memory representation of a document and a file representation of the document. Rather *Keen* discloses: i) filtering information including objects, their attributes, and associated documents according to privilege information; and ii) giving a user limited access to the information.

Combining *Star Office* with *Keen* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Star Office* and *Keen*, either individually or in any reasonable combination, at least do not disclose or suggest "saving the first document with the generic information replacing the removed personal information, wherein saving the first document further comprises, in response to activating the privacy option, replacing the removed personal information with the generic information in both a memory representation of the first document and a file representation of the first document," as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claim 19 includes a similar recitation to Claim 1. Furthermore, combining *Star Office* with *Keen* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Star Office*

and *Keen*, either individually or in any reasonable combination, at least do not disclose or suggest "receiving input by the document-generating program to save the document, wherein saving the document removes the one or more pieces of personal information from the document and the comment visible within block of the document or replacing replaces the one or more pieces of personal information with generic information in the document and the comment box visible within block of the document in both a memory representation of the document and a file representation of the document," as recited by amended Claim 11. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 11, and 19 each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1, 11, and 19.

Dependent Claims 3, 5, 7-10, 12, 14, 16-18, 20, and 27 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1, 11, and 19, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1, 11, and 19. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent 3, 5, 7-10, 12, 14, 16-18, 20, and 27.

II. New Claims

Claims 28-29 have been added to more distinctly define and to round out the protection for the invention to which Applicants are entitled. Support for these new claims can be found in the specification at least on page 13, lines 9-23. Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable over the cited art and that they add no new matter.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.


Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404.954.5066

Date: December 18, 2006

DKS:mdc



D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

